the decision of the United Arab Emirates to expatriate illegal immigrants from Asian countries;

(b) if so, the number of Indians expatriated from UAE;

(c) the States to which these expatriated Indians belong; and

(d) the nature and extent of the Central assistance given/proposed to be given to the state Governments concerned for the rehabilitation of these expatriated Indians from the UAE?

THE MINISTER OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS (SHRI I.K. GUJRAL): (a) to (c) Government of UAE had announced a three month amnesty for all illegal expatriates including illegal immigrants from Asian countries in UAE starting from July 1, 1996 to September 30, 1996, which was extended by another one month upto October 31, 1996. All illegal expatriates in the UAE were required to leave during the amnesty period without paying fine or serving jail term. An estimated 60,000 Indian nationals are said to have availed of the amnesty. According to the available information, the Indian illegal expatriates mainly belong to the states of Kerla, Andhra Pradesh, Punjab, Tamil Nadu, Gujarat, Rajasthan and Karnataka.

(d) No central assistance was given or proposed to be given to the State governments concerned for the rehabilitation of these expatriate Indians from the UAE. However, our mission in Abu Dhabi and Consulate General in Dubai are closely monitoring the emerging employment oportunities in UAE with a view to facilitate the return of the expatriated Indians to UAE in a legitimate manner.

Writs Against Dot in Delhi

591. SHRI SATISH AGARWAL: Will the Minister of COMMUNICATIONS be pleased to state:

(a) whether some of the Letters of Intent (LOI) holders for the Basic Telephone services have filed writs in the Delhi High Court against the department of Telecommunication;

(b) if so, the particulars of the writs filled; and

(c) the action proposed by Government to ensure early and favourable disosposal?

THE MINISTER OF COMMUNICATIONS (SHRI BENI PRASAD VERMA): (a) Two out of the seven Letter of Intent holdig companies have filed civil Suits in the High Court of Delhi.

(b) the particulars are given in the enclosed statement. (*see* below);

(c) The Additional Solicitor General of India and Senior Standing Government counsel in Delhi High Court are defending the case of behalf of the Government.

Statement

Court Cases filed by M/s. HFCL Rezen Telecom. Ltd. and M/s. Basic Teleservices

1. M/s. HFCL Bezeq Telecom. Ltd. was issued Letters of Intent for providing Basic Telephone Service in four Circles namely, Delhi, Haryana, U.P (West) and Orissa in March, 1996. The company did not submit the extension of Earnest Money Bank Guarantee and validity of the bid as directed by the Government. The Government, therefore, decided to encash their Earnest Money Bank Guarantee amounting to Rs. 105 crores. M/s. HFCL Bezeq Ltd. then filed a Civil Suit No. 1481 of 96 in the High Court of Delhi.

2. M/s. Basic Teleservices was issued Letter of Intent for providing Basic Telephone Service in Tamilnadu Circle. This Company did not give the acceptance of the LOI by the due date. The Government, therefore, decided to encash their earnest money bank guarantee amounting to Rs. 50 crores. This company also filed a civil suit No. 2686 of 1996 in High Court of Delhi against this action of the Government.